## 10/22/02-03386

Baker

Michael Baker Jr., Inc. A Unit of Michael Baker Corporation

Airport Office Park, Bldg. 3 420 Rouser Road Coraopolis, PA 15108

412-269-6000 FAX 412-269-2002

October 22, 2002

Commander, Atlantic Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command 1510 Gilbert Street (Bldg. N-26) Norfolk, Virginia 23511-2699

Attn: Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E.

Navy Technical Representative

Code EV23-KAS

Re: Contract N62470-95-D-6007

Navy CLEAN II, District III Contract Task Order (CTO) 0219

Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA)

Operable Unit No. 6, Sites 36, 43, 44 and 54

Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune, North Carolina

Dear Mr. Stevens:

This letter report presents the Final Engineering Evaluation/Cost Analysis (EE/CA) for non-time-critical removal actions (NTCRAs) being considered for Sites 36 and 43 at Operable Unit (OU) No. 6, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejcune, North Carolina. An EE/CA was prepared concurrently with the Record of Decision (ROD) in order to expedite the removal action of contaminated soil as recommended in the Final Feasibility Study (FS) for OU No. 6.

OU No. 6 is comprised of four sites; 36, 43, 44, and 54. This report presents the location-specific NTCRA recommended for two of these Sites; 36 and 43. Soil is not a media of concern at Site 44<sup>1</sup> based upon results of the human health and ecological risk assessments, therefore a remedial response is not necessary. As for Site 54, contaminated soil was removed in April, 2001 by the Remedial Action Contractor (RAC). Based upon the work completed to date, further actions are not warranted at Sites 44 and 54. As such, these two sites will not be discussed further in this EE/CA.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Baker, 2002. "Final Feasibility Study for Operable Unit No. 6, Sites 36, 43, 44 and 54", Baker Environmental, Inc. July 23, 2002.

Baker ....

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002

Page 2

As required by Section 300.415(b)(4)(i) of the National Contingency Plan (NCP), an EE/CA must be completed for all NTCRAs. The goals of the EE/CA are to identify the objectives of the proposed removal action and to analyze the effectiveness, implementability and cost of various alternatives that may satisfy the objectives. Thus, an EE/CA serves an analogous function to, but is more streamlined than, the RI/FS conducted for remedial actions. This EE/CA was prepared in letter format at the request of the Partnering Team. The document is designed to be concise and specific to the subject sites, while following guidance contained in the EPA directive<sup>2</sup>.

**EE/CA Administrative Requirements** 

The EE/CA is part of the administrative record file and is subject to the public comment and comment response requirements of the administrative record. A public notice describing the EE/CA is required to be published in a major local newspaper. For NTCRAs, the NCP requires a 30-day public comment period on the EE/CA. Soliciting and responding to public comments on the administrative record, including the EE/CA, is required by Section 300.820(a) of the NCP.

NTCRAs funded by the USEPA have a \$2 million and a 12-month statutory limit pursuant to Section 104(c)(1) of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). However, because removal actions at MCB, Camp Lejeune are not funded by the USEPA, these statutory limits do not apply.

Site Background and History

Site 36

Site 36 is located approximately 1,000 feet east of Camp Geiger and 500 feet west of the New River, adjacent to the Camp Geiger Sewage Treatment Plant. Camp Geiger is situated directly north of Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS), New River, and approximately 3 miles southwest of Jacksonville, North Carolina (see Figure 1).

<sup>2</sup> USEPA, 1993. "Guidance on Conducting Non-Time-Critical Removal Actions Under CERCLA", Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, Washington, D.C., August 1993.

Challenge Us.

Baker

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 3

Figure 2 shows the features of Site 36. The site encompasses nearly 20 acres and is comprised primarily of open fields and wooded areas. A gravel road bisects the site and provides access to Jack's Point Recreation Area, located approximately one-quarter mile to the east. The site is bordered to the north and east by Brinson Creek and a wooded area, to the south by an unnamed tributary to Brinson Creek, and to the west by an improved (i.e., coarse gravel) road. Further to the west of the improved road lies an abandoned railroad right-of-way, once part of the Seaboard Coastline Railroad.

Site 36 reportedly has been used for the disposal of municipal wastes and mixed industrial wastes including trash, waste oils, solvents and hydraulic fluids that were generated at MCAS, New River. The dump was active from the late 1940s to the late 1950s. Most of the material was burned and buried; however, some unburned material was also buried. Reportedly, less than five percent of all waste hydrocarbon material generated at MCAS, New River was disposed at Site 36. The remaining waste oil was reportedly used for dust control on roads or discharged directly to storm drains.

Parts of the site have been changed due to the construction of the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Route 17 by-pass project. Several of the gravel roads that ran through the site have been widened and the elevation raised, serving as the subgrade for the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Route 17 by-pass. The NCDOT Route 17 by-pass construction extends outside the boundaries of the Site 36 study area and lies to the west of the site.

Site 43

Site 43 is comprised of approximately 11 acres and is located within the operations area of MCAS, New River, two miles west of the New River. Vehicular access to the site is via Agan Street from Curtis Road.

Figure 3 shows the site features for Site 43. The site is located at the northern terminus of Agan Street, adjacent to an abandoned wastewater treatment plant. The site is bordered to the north by Edwards Creek, to the east and south by Strawhorn Creek, and to the west by Agan Street and the former sewage disposal facility. Strawhorn Creek discharges into Edwards Creek at Site 43. Edwards Creek then discharges into the New River approximately 2,000 feet north of the study area, near Site 36.

Baker

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 4

Much of this site is heavily vegetated with dense shrubs and trees greater than three inches in diameter. Marsh areas prone to flooding surround both the Strawhorn and Edwards Creeks. An improved gravel loop road provides access to the main portion of the study area; other, smaller unimproved paths extend outward from the gravel loop road.

The Agan Street Dump reportedly received mainly inert material such as construction debris (i.e., fiberglass and lumber) and trash. Sludge from the former sewage disposal facility, located adjacent to the study area, was also dumped at Site 43. The time period during which disposal activities occurred, however, is not known.

#### **Previous Removal Actions**

Site 36

Based on the results of the 1995 Final RI, a TCRA was performed at Site 36 in July 1997 by the RAC. This included the excavation of approximately 92 tons of TSCA regulated polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) contaminated soil and approximately 148 tons of mixed CERCLA regulated and PCB-contaminated soil from Site 36 (Figure 4). The contaminated soil was disposed of in an appropriate treatment/disposal facility.

Upon completion of excavation activities, confirmatory sampling was performed demonstrating that soils remaining on site exhibited concentrations of PCBs below the action levels specified in the work plans (10 milligrams per kilogram [mg/kg]) for PCBs. Site restoration included the placement of clean backfill from an off-site borrow pit, the replacement of gravel on the gravel road and revegetation.

Site 43

During 1995, a TCRA was performed at Site 43 by the RAC to remove surficial metallic debris found during the Site Inspection (SI). Project activities involved the removal of all surficial metallic debris, including empty drums, various scrap metals and an old tank vehicle. Additionally, the RAC collected, sampled and shipped off-site four drums (1,400 lbs.) of hazardous materials for disposal. Site restoration included regrading the site due to the removal of the old tank vehicle and other debris.

Challenge Us.

Baker II.

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 5

**Nature and Extent of Contamination** 

Site 36

Based on site investigations conducted to date, including the Remedial Investigation (Baker, 1995), soil is the environmental media of concern at Site 36 for this EE/CA. Soil contaminants of concern to be addressed with a NTCRA include polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) and pesticides. The final soil contaminants of concern (COCs) for the proposed residential land use NTCRA are summarized on Table 1. For this removal, United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) Region IX Residential Preliminary Remediation Goals (PRGs) were used for estimating the volumes of contaminated soil and costs in the Final FS for OU 6. Although lead is a COC for this site, soil with lead contamination will be addressed with institutional controls as opposed to a NTCRA.

Site 43

Based on site investigations conducted to date, including the Remedial Investigation, soil is the environmental media of concern at Site 43 for this EE/CA. Soil contaminants of concern to be addressed with a NTCRA include PAHs. The final soil COCs for the proposed residential land use NTCRA are summarized on Table 2. For this removal, USEPA Region IX Residential PRGs were used for estimating the volumes of contaminated soil and costs in the Final FS for OU 6.

**Analytical Data** 

Site 36

A summary of the analytical data collected during the Remedial Investigation at Site 36 is presented on Table 3. Localized areas of contamination at Site 36 were screened against residential criteria for PAHs and pesticides. The soil sample locations containing exceedances of PAH and pesticide criteria are shown on Figure 5.

Site 43

Challengel/s.



Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 6

A summary of the analytical data collected during the Remedial Investigation at Site 43 is presented on Table 4. Localized areas of contamination at Site 43 were screened against residential criteria for PAHs. The soil sample locations containing exceedances of PAH screening criteria are shown on Figure 6.

#### **Risk Assessment Summary**

Site 36

- For the current exposure scenario, fishermen exhibited a potential risk for ingestion of fish and crab tissue from Brinson Creek. Levels of arsenic and mercury in fish tissue and arsenic and lead in crab tissue contributed to this risk.
- There is also an unacceptable noncarcinogenic risk for future child residents exposed to iron in subsurface soil

Site 43

- There are no unacceptable human health risks for current receptors at Site 43
- No carcinogenic risks were identified for future adult and child residents or construction workers

#### **Removal Action Objectives**

Removal action objectives are medium-specific or site-specific goals established for protecting human health and the environment. At OU No. 6, the environmental media to be addressed by removal actions proposed in this EE/CA include contaminated soil in localized areas of Site 36 and Site 43. The removal action objective for OU No. 6 is to remove or mitigate potential exposure to PAH (Sites 36 and 43) and pesticide (Site 36 only) contaminated surface and subsurface soil that contain contaminants related to past site practices.

Baker

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 7

#### **Determination of Removal Action Scope**

The selected removal actions are intended to be the final corrective actions to be implemented at OU No. 6 to achieve the identified removal action objective. The removal actions selected in this EE/CA are intended to remove soils in areas with elevated PAH and pesticide (Site 36 only) contamination. For this removal, USEPA Region IX PRGs were used for estimating the volumes of contaminated soil and costs in the Final FS for OU 6.

#### **Determination of Removal Action Schedule**

Construction activities for the selected removal actions are anticipated to require less than 12 months. Factors that may affect the removal action schedule relate to administrative requirements and seasonal restrictions. For example, inclement weather (storms or hurricanes) can delay execution of soil removal remedial actions.

#### **Summary of Soil Removal Action Alternatives (RAAs)**

A wide range of potential RAAs are available for Sites 36 and 43 that represent various levels of response actions, land use controls and remediation costs. The following removal alternatives are presented to address PAH and pesticide contamination in soil at OU No. 6. Table 5 provides a summary of the soil RAAs for OU No. 6.

Site 36

#### 36S RAA 1: No Action

\$0

No remedial actions taken

#### 36S RAA 2: Capping and Institutional Controls for Lead Contaminated Areas

\$188,000

- Localized impacted PAH and pesticide soil areas capped
- Site is graded and revegetated
- Areas exceeding USEPA residential action level for lead (400 ppm) are surveyed and delineated



Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 8

• Land use controls for intrusive activity within the capped areas and future use restrictions for lead contaminated areas are imposed at Site 36

#### 36S RAA 3: Excavation and Off-Site Disposal and Institutional Controls for

#### Lead Contaminated Areas

\$201,000

- Localized impacted PAH and pesticide soil areas excavated
- Excavated soil is disposed in the Base landfill
- Site restored to pre-excavation conditions
- Areas exceeding USEPA residential action level for lead (400 ppm) are surveyed and delineated
- Land use controls future use restrictions for lead contaminated areas are imposed at Site 36

Site 43

#### 43S RAA 1: No Action

\$0

No physical remedial actions implemented

#### 43S RAA 2: Capping and Institutional Controls

\$170,000

- Localized impacted PAH areas capped
- Site is graded and revegetated
- Intrusive activity restrictions

#### 43S RAA 3: Excavation and Off-Site Disposal and Institutional Controls

\$119,000

- Localized impacted PAH areas excavated
- Excavated soil is disposed in the Base landfill
- Site restored to pre-excavation conditions
- Intrusive activity restrictions

#### Comparative Analysis of Soil Removal Action Alternatives

The following presents a comparative analysis of the RAAs presented for soil at OU No. 6. The purpose of the comparative analysis is to identify the relative advantages and disadvantages of each RAA.

Challengeus.

Baker -

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 9

Site 36

Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

Each alternative will protect human health and the environment with the exception of 36S RAA 1, the no action alternative. 36S RAA 3 is most protective of human health and the environment because in this alternative, areas of elevated PAH and pesticide contaminated soil are removed from the site. 36S RAA 2 offers reduced exposure pathways through capping. Both 36S RAA 2 and 36S RAA 3 control exposure pathways for lead contamination, and accordingly protect human health, through future land use and excavation restrictions. However, no physical means will be used to protect the environment from exposure to lead contamination at Site 36.

Compliance with ARARs

All of the RAAs, except for no action, meet the chemical-specific ARARs and remedial goals for the desired future land use. Location-specific and action-specific ARARs are met as applicable within each RAA.

Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

The no action alternative will not be effective over the long term in protecting human health and the environment because the contaminants will remain at the site and will not be contained, removed or treated. 36S RAA 3 will be effective in the long term because PAH and pesticide contamination is removed or controls are in place to protect potential receptors. 36S RAA 2 will be effective in the long term if the soil cover is properly maintained into the future, and land use controls will protect potential receptors. Institutional controls for the lead contaminated areas under 36S RAAs 2 And 3 will be effective if land use restrictions are observed.

Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume Through Treatment

The no action alternative will not reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminated soil at Site 36. 36S RAA 2 will reduce the mobility of PAH and pesticide contaminants but not the toxicity or volume of

Challengel/s..

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002

Page 10

the soil itself. However, because capping will reduce contact with contaminated soil by human and ecological receptors, the potential toxicity will be reduced. 36S RAA 3 will reduce the toxicity, mobility, and volume of contaminants for the desired future land use through removal of contaminants from the site. Institutional controls for the lead contaminated areas under 36S RAA 2 and 36S RAA 3 will not reduce the toxicity, mobility or volume of lead contaminated soil, but would control exposure to lead contaminated soils on site.

Short-Term Effectiveness

The no action alternative is not effective for protecting human health and the environment in the short term. The contaminants will remain in place and will not be disturbed. 36S RAA 3 requires excavation of contaminated soil that could increase the exposure of construction workers and ecological receptors to contaminated soils in the short term. However, exposure to human health and the environment will be minimized by the proper use of personal protective equipment, erosion and sediment control measures, and dust controls. Institutional controls for the lead contaminated areas under 36S RAAs 2 and 3 will be effective for protecting human health against lead exposure as soon as the land use controls are implemented, however, it will not be protective of the environment. It is estimated that all the alternatives can be implemented in less than one year.

**Implementability** 

The no action alternative requires no effort because no changes will be made to affect current site conditions. 36S RAAs 2 and 3 are more difficult to implement and require the mobilization and operation of specialized equipment, and more effort for planning and design. Institutional controls for the lead contaminated areas under 36S RAAs 2 and 3 simply involves the implementation of land use controls and excavation restrictions for lead contaminated soils at the site. Land use controls are required for each alternative except the no action alternative. Excavation restrictions are placed on 36S RAAs 2 and 3.

Cost

Estimated total net present worth cost for each RAA is presented on Table 5.

Challenge Us.

Baker .

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 11

Site 43

Overall Protection of Human Health and the Environment

Each alternative will protect human health and the environment for the desired future land use with the exception of 43S RAA 1, the no action alternative. 43S RAA 3 is most protective of human health and the environment because in this alternative an area of elevated PAH contaminated soils is removed from the site. 43S RAA 2 offers reduced exposure pathways for residential land uses through capping.

Compliance with ARARs

All of the RAAs, except for no action, meet the chemical-specific ARARs and remedial goals for the desired future land use. Location-specific and action-specific ARARs are met as applicable within each RAA.

Long-Term Effectiveness and Permanence

The no action alternative will not be effective over the long term in protecting human health and the environment because the contaminants will remain at the site and will not be contained, removed or treated. 43S RAA 3 will be most effective in the long term because site contamination is permanently removed from the site. 43S RAA 2, a capping alternative, will be effective in the long term if the soil cover is properly maintained into the future.

Reduction of Toxicity, Mobility, or Volume Through Treatment

The no action alternative will not reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminated soil at Site 43. 43S RAA 2 will reduce the mobility of contaminants but not the toxicity or volume of the soil itself. However, because capping will reduce contact with contaminated soil by human and ecological receptors, the potential toxicity will be reduced. 43S RAA 3 will reduce the toxicity, mobility, or volume of contaminants for the desired future land use through removal of contaminants from the site.

Challenge Us.

Baker :

Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002

Page 12

Short-Term Effectiveness

The no action alternative is not effective for protecting human health and the environment in the short

term. The contaminants will remain in place and will not be disturbed. 43S RAA 3 requires excavation of

contaminated soil that could increase the exposure of construction workers and ecological receptors to

contaminated soils in the short term. However, exposure to human health and the environment will be

minimized by the proper use of personal protective equipment, erosion and sediment control measures.

and dust controls. It is estimated that all the alternatives can be implemented is less than one year.

**Implementability** 

The no action alternative requires no effort because no changes will be made to affect current site

conditions. 43S RAAs 2 and 3 are more difficult to implement and require the mobilization and operation

of specialized equipment, and more effort for planning and design. 43S RAA 2 also will implement

excavation restrictions (i.e., intrusive activity controls). This required land use control is easily

implemented and will be maintained by the Base through the Base Master Planning Process.

Cost

Estimated total net present worth cost for each RAA is presented on Table 5.

**Recommended Removal Action Alternative** 

Site 36

The preferred remedial action for contaminated soil at Site 36 is:

36S RAA 3: Excavation and Off-Site Disposal and Institutional Controls for Lead Contaminated Areas

Limited areas of pesticide and PAH contaminated soils will be removed from the site

Excavation is necessary in four small areas (less than 950 CY) of Site 36

Challengel/s.



Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 13

- Identifying intrusive boundaries for lead contaminated soils will be acceptable for reducing exposure pathways to lead at Site 36
- Lead contamination exceeds the EPA action level of 400 ppm mostly in the subsurface soils, therefore it is unlikely that it will migrate by wind or water

#### Actions to be taken:

- Soil removal and disposal in the Base landfill (Figure 7)
- Confirmatory sampling
- Regrading and revegetation of the site to pre-excavation conditions
- A surveying crew will delineate the lead contaminated areas
- Implement intrusive activity controls and industrial use controls for lead contaminated areas through the LUCIP for Site 36

Site 43

The preferred remedial alternative for soil at Site 43 is:

#### 43S RAA 3: Excavation and Off-Site Disposal

- Limited areas of PAH contaminated soils will be removed from the site
- Excavation in one area (less than 750 CY) of Site 43

#### Actions to be taken:

- Soil removal and disposal in the Base landfill (areas of proposed excavation shown on Figure 8)
- Confirmatory sampling
- Regrading and revegetation of the site to pre-excavation conditions
- Intrusive activity restrictions because this site is a former disposal area through the LUCIP for Site 43



Mr. Kirk Stevens, P.E. October 22, 2002 Page 14

This EE/CA provides a summary and comparison of alternative removal actions evaluated and the removal action selected for the location-specific NTCRAs for Site 36 and Site 43, as required by the NCP.

Baker appreciates the opportunity to serve LANTDIV on this very important project. Should you have any questions or concerns regarding this report, or if I can be of further assistance on other CTO 0219 issues, please do not hesitate to contact me at 412-269-2033 or rbonelli@mbakercorp.com.

Sincerely,

BAKER ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Rich Bonelli

Activity Manager

Attachments

cc:

Ms. Beth Collier, Code AQ115 (letter only)

Mr. Rick Raines, MCB, Camp Lejeune (1 copy)

Ms. Gena Townsend, EPA (1 copy)

Mr. David Lown, NC DENR (1 copy)

Ms. Diane Rossi, NC DENR (letter only)

Dr. Charlie Stehman, NC DENR (1 copy)

Mr. Ron Kenyon, Shaw Environmental, Inc. (1 copy)

Mr. Chris Bozzini, CH2M Hill (1 copy)

Mr. Scott Bailey, CH2M Hill (1 copy)

## TABLE 1 SITE 36 FINAL SOIL COCs

#### OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219 MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

#### Contaminant

#### SEMIVOLATILES

Benzo(a)anthracene (PAH)

Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)

Benzo(b)fluoranthene (PAH)

Dibenz(a,h)anthracene (PAH)

Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)

n-Nitro-di-n-propylamine

#### PESTICIDES/PCBs

4-4'-DDE

4-4'-DDT

Dieldrin

gamma-Chlordane

Heptachlor epoxide

METALS

Lead

#### Notes:

The PRGs were used to estimate the approximate areas and depth of the removal actions, and were used for cost estimating purposes. The actual volumes proposed for removal will be determined in the field during the remedial action. For lead, the EPA OSWER Action level was used to establish the institutional control boundaries.

#### TABLE 2

#### **SITE 43 FINAL SOIL COCs**

#### OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219 MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

#### Contaminant

#### SEMIVOLATILES)

Benzo(a)anthracene (PAH)

Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)

Benzo(b)fluoranthene (PAH)

Benzo(k)fluoranthene (PAH)

Dibenz(a,h)anthracene (PAH)

Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)

#### Notes:

The PRGs were used to estimate the approximate areas and depth of the removal actions, and were used for cost estimating purposes. The actual volumes proposed for removal will be determined in the field during the remedial action.

#### TABLE 3

#### REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 36 OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

	1		Screening	Site Contamination		Maximum	Detection	
edia	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria <sup>(5)</sup>	Min.	Max.	Location	Frequency	Distribution
face Soil	Volatiles	Trichloroethene	2,800	4	4	FDA-SB03	1/61	eastern, former disposal area
		Tetrachloroethene	5,700	2	3	36-GW12	3/61	northern, ground scar area
		Toluene	520,000	8	98	OF-SB01	4/61	south central, open field
	-	Styrene	1,700,000	39	39	GS-SB03	1/61	northern, ground scar area
		Xylene (total)	210,000	7	7	OF-SB06B	1/61	south central, open field
	Semivolatiles	n-Nitro-di-n-propylamine	69	320	320	DAB-SB03	1/57	southeastern, drum area
		Naphthalene (PAH)	56,000	48	120	OF-SB04	2/57	1 south central, 1 western
		2-Methylnapthalene	1,600,000	54	82	OA-SB01A	2/57	1 south central, 1 western
		Acenaphthene (PAH)	3,700,000	330	330	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		Dibenzofuran	290,000	150	150	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		Fluorene (PAH)	2,600,000	200	200	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		Phenanthrene (PAH)	NA	59	2,500	OF-SB04	4/57	scattered
		Anthracene (PAH)	22,000,000	780	780	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		Carbazole	NA	240	240	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		Fluoranthene (PAH)	2,300,000	54	5,500	OF-SB04	5/57	4 southeastern, drum area
		Pyrene (PAH)	2,300,000	41	11,000	OF-SB04	8/57	5 southeastern, drum area
		Butylbenzylphthalate	12,000,000	51	290	OA-SB03	3/57	western
		B(a)anthracene (PAH)	620	46	3,900	OF-SB04	2/57	1 south central, 1 southeastern
		Chrysene (PAH)	62,000	51	4,600	OF-SB04	5/57	3 southeastern, drum area
		B(b)fluoranthene (PAH)	620	51	3,600	OF-SB04	3/57	scattered
		B(k)fluoranthene (PAH)	6,200	39	1,500	OF-SB04	2/57	I south central, 1 southeastern
		Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	62	40	3,300	OF-SB04	2/57	1 south central, 1 western
		I(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)	620	46	2,700	OF-SB04	3/57	scattered
	İ	D(a,h)anthracene (PAH)	62	720	720	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
		B(g,h,i)perylene (PAH)	NA	2,400	2,400	OF-SB04	1/57	south central, open field
	Pesticides	gamma-BHC (Lindane)	440	4	4	OF-SB06D	1/57	south central, open field
		Aldrin	29	5	5.1	OF-SB03	3/57	1 open field, 2 adjacent toSB01
		Heptachlor	110	1.9	1.9	FCA-SB12	1/57	southwestern, former cleared area
		Heptachlor epoxide	53	2	67	OA-SB011	10/57	scattered, 3 adjacent to SB01
		Endosulfan I	370000	8.3	36	OA-SB01E	3/57	all adjacent to SB01
		Dieldrin	30	2	16,000	OF-SB03	21/57	scattered
	:	4-4'-DDE	1700	2.2	2,600	OA-SB01A	49/57	widely scattered, prevalent
		Endrin	18000	9.9	9.9	OA-SB08		eastern, former disposal area
		4-4'-DDD	2400	2.8	550	OA-SB01A		widely scattered, prevalent
		Endosulfan Sulfate	NA	2.5	4.2	OF-SB06	2/57	1 south central, 1 western
	İ	4-4'-DDT	1700	1.8	12,000	OA-SB01A	<del> </del>	widely scattered, prevalent
		Endrin Ketone	NΛ	15	15	OF-SB03	l	south central, open field
	İ	Endrin aldehyde	NA	12	12	OF-SB02	<u></u>	south central, open field
		alpha-Chlordane	1600	1.2	980	OA-SB05	ļ.,,,,,	scattered
		gamma-Chlordane	1600	1.2	840	OA-SB05		scattered
	PCBs (1)	Aroclor 1248	220	68	24,000	OA-SB011		western, surrounding SB01
		Aroclor 1254	220	92	530	OA-SB01		western, surrounding SB01
	Metals	Aluminum	76,000	1,010	17,600	FCA-SB09		scattered
		Antimony	31	3.3	31.7	OA-SB08		scattered
		Arsenic	22	0.39	10.4	OA-SB08		scattered

#### TABLE 3 (continued)

#### REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 36 OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

			Screening	Site Contamination		Maximum	Detection		
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria <sup>(5)</sup>	Min. Max.		Location	Frequency	Distribution	
Surface Soil	Metals	Barium	5,400	4.5	141	OA-SB08	51/52	scattered	
(Continued)	(Continued)	Beryllium	150	0.18	0.18	FCA-SB10	1/52	1 detection southwest	
		Cadmium	37	0.7	6.3	OA-SB08	8/52	scattered	
		Calcium	NA	106	103,000	OF-SB06	51/52	scattered	
	ļ	Chromium	210	1.6	51.6	OA-SB08	52/52	scattered	
		Cobalt	4,700	0.88	9	OA-SB08	10/52	scattered	
		Copper	2,900	0.6	445	OA-SB08	39/52	scattered	
		Iron	23,000	863	86,200	OA-SB08	52/52	scattered	
		Lead	400	4.3	836	OA-SB08	48/52	scattered	
		Magnesium	NA	52	1,020	DAD-SB01	52/52	scattered	
		Manganese	1,800	2.1	940	OA-SB08	52/52	scattered	
		Mercury	23	0.1	2.4	OA-SB05	18/52	scattered	
		Nickel	1,600	1	48.3	OA-SB08	26/52	scattered	
	İ	Potassium	NA	33.7	676	FCA-SB05	32/52	scattered	
		Selenium	390	0.32	0.53	36-SB06D	12/52	scattered	
		Silver	390,000	0.6	12	OF-SB04	8/48	3 south central	
		Sodium	NA	9.6	358	DAD-SB01	31/52	scattered	
		Vanadium	550	2.9	46	OA-SB08	50/52	scattered	
		Zinc	23,000	2.1	1,320	OA-SB08	50/52	scattered	
Subsurface	Volatiles	Acetone	1,600,000	12	480	GS-SB03	8/62	I exceeds blank, ground sear area	
Soil		1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	63,000	4	4	OA-SB01	1/62	western	
		Trichloroethene	2,800	3	5	FDA-SB01	3/62	2 eastern, 1 western	
		Benzene	670	3	3	FDA-SB01	1/62	eastern, former disposal area	
		Toluene	520,000	5	17	OF-SB06	5/62	south central, open field	
		Xylene (total)	210,000	2	6	FDA-SB06	8/62	scattered	
	Semivolatiles	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	3,400	97	97	DAB-SB02	1/57	southeastern, drum area	
		2-Methylphenol	3,100,000	510	510	DAB-SB01	1/58	southeastern, drum area	
		4-Methylphenol	310,000	43	43	DAB-SB01	1/58	southeastern, drum area	
		Isophorone	510,000	2,100	2,100	DAB-SB01	1/58	southeastern, drum area	
		Naphthalene (PAH)	56,000	41	41	OA-SB01A	1/57	western	
		2-Methylnaphthalene	1,600,000	65	85	FDA-SB02	2/57	1 eastern, 1 western	
		Phenanthrene (PAH)	NA	48	190	OA-SB07	3/57	scattered	
		Di-n-butylphtalate	6,100,000	56	56	OA-SB01	1/58	western	
		Fluoranthene (PAH)	2,300,000	130	320	OA-SB07	3/57	2 eastern, 1 south central	
		Pyrene (PAH)	2,300,000	59	320	OA-SB07		scattered	
		Butylbenzylphtalate	12,000,000	42	170	OA-SB03	3/57	scattered	
		B(a)anthracene (PAH)	620	69	140	OA-SB07	3/57	scattered	
		Chrysene (PAH)	62,000	41	200	OA-SB07	5/57	3 eastern, former disposal area	
		B(b)fluoranthene (PAH)	620	44	170	OA-SB07	5/57	4 eastern, 1 south central	
	Semivolatiles	B(k)fluoranthene (PAH)	6,200	42	68	OA-SB07	3/57	eastern, former disposal area	
		Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	62	72	450	GS-SB03	4/57	3 eastern, 1 northern	
		I(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)	620	48	110	OA-SB07	3/57	eastern, former disposal area	
		B(g,h,i)perylene (PAH)	NA	42	89	OA-SB07		eastern, former disposal area	
	Pesticides	gamma-BHC (Lindane)	440	4	4	OF-SB06D		open field	
	1 '	Aldrin	29	1.5	16	36-GW11	5/56	3 southeastern, 2 eastern	

#### TABLE 3 (continued)

# REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 36 OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219 MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

			Screening	Site Cont	amination	Maximum	Detection	
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria <sup>(5)</sup>	Min.	Max.	Location	ı	Distribution
Subsurface	Pesticides	Heptachlor Epoxide	53	3.4	14	36-GW11	3/56	3 eastern, former disposal area
Soil	(continued)	Dieldrin	30	2.2	1,200	FDA-SB05	17/56	scattered
(Continued)		4,4'-DDE	1,700	2.3	1,700	OA-SB01A	29/56	widely scattered, prevalent
		Endrin	18,000	2.4	5	OF-SB06B	5/56	scattered
		Endosulfan II	NA	2.0	2.0	OF-SB06B	1/56	south central, open field
		4,4'-DDD	2,400	2.3	1,300	FDA-SB05	30/56	widely scattered, prevalent
	1	4,4'-DDT	1,700	2.8	3,100	OA-SB01A	28/56	widely scattered, prevalent
		Endrin Aldehyde	NA	3.5	32	FDA-SB05	3/56	2 south central, 1 eastern
		alpha-Chlordane	1,600	1.6	750	36-GW11	12/56	primarily eastern
		gamma-Chlordane	1,600	2.3	770	36-GW11	9/56	primarily eastern
	PCBs (1)	Aroclor 1248	220	19	850	OA-SB01	5/56	western, adjacent to SB01
	Metals	Aluminum	76,000	752	19,700	FDA-SB05	51/51	scattered
		Antimony	31	4.9	21.6	36-GW11	7/44	eastern
	}	Arsenic	22	0.2	25.9	FDA-SB01	41/51	eastern and central
		Barium	5,400	2	475	36-GW11	50/51	scattered
		Beryllium	150	0.17	0.18	FCA-SB10	2/51	southwestern
		Cadmium	37	0.7	42.8	36-GW11	11/51	eastern and central
		Calcium	NA	15	46,300	OF-SB06B	49/51	scattered
		Chromium	210	1.4	71.9	36-GW11	50/51	eastern and central
		Cobalt	4,700	0.48	9.4	OA-SB07	16/51	scattered
		Copper	2,900	0.5	1,320	OF-SB06B	31/51	scattered
		Iron	23,000	408	132,000	36-GW11	51/51	scattered
		Lead	4.00	1.2	2,680	OA-SB07	50/51	scattered
		Magnesium	NA	20.2	2,700	36-GW11	51/51	scattered
		Manganese	1,800	0.85	1,260	FDA-SB01	47/51	scattered
		Mercury	23	0.12	3.9	OA-SB07	13/51	east/southeastern
		Nickel	1,600	1.1	72.1	DAD-SB02	24/51	scattered
		Potassium	NA	47.2	1,640	FDA-SB06	32/51	scattered
		Selenium	390,000	0.4	1.2	OF-SB06	4/51	southcentral
		Silver	390	0.55	0.89	36-GW11	3/48	east central
		Sodium	NA.	5.2	501	FDA-SB06	34/51	scattered
		Vanadium	550	1.6	52.6	OF-SB06	49/51	scattered
		Zinc	23,000	0.9	2,580	FDA-SB05	<del> </del>	scattered
roundwater	Volatiles (2)	Methylene Chloride	5	1	1	36-GW10	+	does not exceed standard
		1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	70	4	37	36-GW10IW	<del> </del>	none exceed standard
		Trichloroethene	2.8	3	97	36-GW10IW	<del></del>	6 exceed standard, northern
	ļ	Tetrachloroethene	0.7	1	2	36-GW10IW		both exceed standard, northern
		1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	0.17	3	10	36-GW10IW		northern, former ground scar area
	Semivolatiles	ND					0/17	/
	Pesticides	4,4'-DDD	0.14	0.06	0.06	36-GW10		northern, during Round One only
	PCBs	ND					0/18	
	Total Metals	Iron	300	3.3	16,900	36-GW02	20/22	12 exceed standard, scattered
		Manganese	50	19.2	3,180	36-GW09	20/22	12 exceed standard, scattered
		Mercury	1.1	1.4	1.4	36-TW02	<del> </del>	l exceeds standard, southern

#### TABLE 3 (continued)

#### REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 36

#### OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54

#### ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

#### MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

			Screening	Site Cont	amination	Maximum	Detection	Distribution	
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria <sup>(5)</sup>	Min.	Max.	Location	Frequency		
Surface	Volatiles	1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	2,240	7	7	36-SW02	1/7	UT, upgradient of open field	
Water(3)	Semivolatiles	ND					0/7		
	Pesticides	ND					0/7		
	PCBs	ND					0/7		
	Metals (4)	Copper	6.5	56.5	56.5	36-SW01	1/7	1 exceeds fresh standard, not background	
		Iron	1,000	967	4840	36-SW03	7/7	3 exceed fresh standard and background	
		Nickel	8.3	16.4	31.4	36-SW02	4/7	l exceeds salt standard	
Sediment	Volatiles	Tetrachloroethane	NA	4	4	36-SD04	1/13	near mouth of UT at BC	
	Semivolatiles	Diethylphthalate	NA	330	2,135	36-SD05	3/13	UT and near mouth of UT	
		Anthracene	85	46	46	36-SD04	1/13	does not exceed standard, UT	
		Di-n-butylphthalate	NA	218	218	36-SD06	1/13	BC, adjacent to ground scar area	
		Pyrene (PAH)	350	316	316	36-SD02	1/13	UT, does not exceed standard	
	Pesticides	Aldrin	NA	0.9	0.9	36-SD01	1/13	UT, upgradient	
		Dieldrin	NA	0.8	52	36-SD06	3/13	2 from BC, minimum from UT	
		4,4'-DDE	2	32	1,200	36-SD05	9/13	9 exceed standard, higher in BC	
		Endrin	0.02	6.6	6.6	36-SD02	1/13	UT, upgradient of open field	
		4,4'-DDD	2	14	1,140	36-SD05	12/13	12 exceed standard	
		Endosulfan Sulfate	NA	3	3	36-SD02	1/13	UT, upgradient of open field	
		4,4'-DDT	1	3	46	36-SD05	11/13	11 exceed standard	
		Endrin Ketone	NA	11	11	36-SD03	1/13	UT, adjacent to open field	
		Endrin Aldehyde	NA	3.5	7.6	36-SD05	2/13	1 from BC, 1 from UT	
		alpha-Chlordane	0.5	6.5	13	36-SD07	2/13	2 exceed standard, upgradient BC	
	PCBs	ND					0/13		
	Metals (4)	Cadmium	5	1.4	8.7	36-SD02	2/15	1 exceeds standard and background, UT	
		Lead	35	7.1	15,100	36-SD06	12/15	7 exceed standard, 1 exceeds background	
		Mercury	0.15	0.2	0.7	36-SD04	3/4	3 exceed standard, 11 rejected	
		Nickel	30	2.1	77.1	36-SD03	11/15	1 exceeds standard, from UT	
		Zinc	120	25.3	140	36-SD02	5/5	1 exceeds standard, not background, UT	

#### Notes:

- Concentrations are presented in ug/L for liquid and ug/kg for solids (ppb), metal concentrations for soils and sediments are presented in mg/kg (ppm).
  - (1) PCB contaminated soil was removed during the removal action that OHM conducted in 1997.
  - (2) An additional round of groundwater samples were collected from wells which exhibited concentrations of volatiles during the first round.
  - (3) Surface water detections were compared to appropriate NCWQS and NOAA screening values, based upon the observed percentage of saltwater at each sampling location.
  - (4) Total metals in surface water and sediment were compared to the range of positve detections in upgradient samples at MCB, Camp Lejeune.
  - (5) Screening criteria are provided as a reference point and are Region IX Residential PRGs for surface and subsurface soil, NCWQS for groundwater, and NOAA for surface water and sediment.

BC - Brinson Creek

NA - Not applicable

NCWQS - North Carolina Water Quality Standard

ND - Not detected

NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

MCL - Federal Maximum Contaminant Level

PAH - Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbon

UT - Unnamed Tributary

#### TABLE 4

# REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 43 OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

eng square com sa go en como como como como como como como com			Screening	Site Contam	ination	Maximum	Detection	
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria (3)	Min.	Max.	Location	Frequency	Distribution
Surface Soil	Volatiles	ND					0/7	
	Semivolatiles	4-Methylphenol	310,000	120	120	DA1-SB02	1/28	northeastern portion of site
		2-Methylnapthalene	1,600,000	74	74	WA-SB01A	1/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Acenaphthylene	NA	71	71	WA-SB01A	1/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Acenaphthene (PAH)	3,700,000	45	2,100	WA-SB01A	3/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Dibenzpfuran	290,000	35	870	WA-SB01A	2/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Fluorene (PAH)	2,600,000	53	1,700	WA-SB01A	3/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Phenanthrene (PAH)	NA	54	5,900	WA-SB01A	8/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Anthracene (PAH)	22,000,000	44	820	WA-SB01A	3/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Carbazole	NA	99	350	WA-SB01A	5/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Fluoranthene (PAH)	2,300,000	49	60,000	WA-SB01A	10/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Pyrene (PAH)	2,300,000	49	64,000	WA-SB01A	10/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Butylbenzylphthalate	12,000,000	50	420	OA-SB03	3/28	maximum northeast of clearing
		B(a)anthracene (PAH)	620	51	40,000	WA-SB01A	9/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Chrysene (PAH)	62,000	110	46,000	WA-SB01A	9/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		B(b)fluoranthene (PAH)	620	44	52,000	WA-SB01A	10/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		B(k)fluoranthene (PAH)	6,200	57	20,000	WA-SB01A	9/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	62	79	39,000	WA-SB01A	9/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		I(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)	620	42	27,000	WA-SB01A	10/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		D(a,h)anthracene (PAH)	62	47	1,200	WA-SB01A	8/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		B(g,h,i)perylene (PAH)	NA	87	24,000	WA-SB01A	9/28	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
	Pesticides	Heptachlor epoxide	53	2	2	WA-SB01A	1/7	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		4-4'-DDE	1,700	5.7	1,000	DA1-SB03	5/7	maximum northeast
		4-4'-DDD	2,400	3,000	3,000	DA1-SB03	1/7	northeastern portion of site
		4-4'-DDT	1,700	10	1,000	DA1-SB03	4/7	maximum northeast
		Endrin aldehyde	NΛ	5.4	5.4	DA2-SB03	1/7	north of clearing
	PCBs	ND					0/7	
	Metals	Cadmium	37	0.7	1.7	WA-SB02	2/21	separate areas
		Chromium	210	1.1	106	DA1-SB02	21/21	scattered

#### TABLE 4 (continued)

## REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 43 OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

#### MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

			Screening	Site Conta	mination	Maximum	Detection	
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria (3)	Criteria (3) Min. Max. Location Fre	Frequency	Distribution		
Surface Soil	Metals	Copper	2,900	0.5	55.7	DA2-SB01	17/21	north of clearing
(continued)	(continued)	Lead	400	4.3	246	DA2-SB01	20/21	scattered
		Manganese	1,800	2.8	189	DA2-SB01	21/21	scattered
	İ	Mercury	23	0.1	0.5	DA1-SB02	3/21	drum areas
		Nickel	1,600	1.1	5	DA2-SB01	8/21	scattered
		Zinc	23,000	1.5	595	DA1-SB02	21/21	scattered
Subsurface Soil	Volatiles	ND					0/7	
	Semivolatiles	Phenanthrene (PAH)	NA	430	430	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Carbazole	NA	73	73	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Fluoranthene (PAH)	2,300,000	850	850	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Pyrene (PAH)	2,300,000	1,800	1,800	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Butylbenzylphtalate	12,000,000	39	440	OA-SB03	2/20	north of clearing
		B(a)anthracene (PAH)	620	390	390	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Chrysene	62,000	740	740	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		B(b)fluoranthene (PAH)	620	780	780	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
	1	B(k)fluoranthene (PAH)	6,200	340	340	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	62	570	570	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		I(1,2,3-cd)pyrene (PAH)	620	890	890	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
		B(g,h,i)perylene (PAH)	NA	790	790	WA-SB02	1/20	clearing adjacent to 43-GW01
	Pesticides	4,4'-DDE	1,700	9	9	DA1-SB03	1/7	northeastern portion or site
		4,4'-DDD	2,400	1,200	1,200	DA1-SB03	1/7	northeastern portion or site
		4,4'-DDT	1,700	45	45	DA1-SB03	1/7	northeastern portion or site
	PCBs	ND					0/7	
	Metals	Copper	2,900	0.4	3.6	OA-SB01	6/20	north of clearing
Groundwater	Volatiles	ND					0/10	
	Semivolatiles	4-Methylphenol	3.5	2	2	43-TW04	1/10	north near SHC and EC
	Pesticides	ND					0/10	
	PCBs	ND					0/6	
	Total Metals	Iron	300	109	33,800	43-TW04	10/10	8 exceed standard, scattered
		Manganese	50	4.4	107	43-TW04	10/10	2 exceed standard, central and north

#### TABLE 4 (continued)

## REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION RESULTS FOR SITE 43

#### **OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54**

### ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219

#### MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

		TOWNSON PROPOSED AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN		Site Conta	mination	Maximum	Detection		
Media	Fraction	Detected Contaminants	Criteria (3)	Min.	Max.	Location	Frequency	Distribution	
Surface Water (1)	Volatiles	1,2-Dichloroethene (total)	2,240	2	2	EC-SW02	2/6	neither exceed standard, EC	
	Semivolatiles	ND					0/6		
	Pesticides	4,4-DDE	0.14	0.1	0.1	EC-SW01	2/6	do not exceed standard, 1 EC, 1 SHC	
		4,4-DDD	0.025	0.1	0.6	EC-SW01	3/6	3 exceed standard, 1 EC, 2 SHC	
	PCBs	ND					0/6		
	Metals (2)	Copper	2.9	1.8	3.2	EC-SW02	3/6	1 exceed standard, not background	
Sediment	Volatiles	Carbon Disulfide	NA	3	26	EC-SD02	3/12	2 from EC and 1 from SHC	
	Semivolatiles	4-Methylphenol	NA	210	210	SHC-SD03	1/12	adjacent to study area, SHC	
		Pyrene (PAH)	350	200	200	EC-SD02	1/12	does not exceed standard, EC	
		Benzo(a)pyrene (PAH)	400	290	1,900	SHC-SD02	4/12	3 exceed standard, 2 EC and 1 SHC	
	Pesticides	4,4'-DDE	2	12	8,900	SHC-SD04	10/12	10 exceed standard, scattered	
		Endrin	NA	12	16	EC-SD01	2/11	1 detection EC and 1 SHC	
		4,4'-DDD	2	5.6	37,000	SHC-SD04	11/12	11 exceed standard, scattered	
		4,4'-DDT	1	9.3	180	EC-SD01	6/12	6 exceed standard, scattered	
		alpha-Chlordane	0.5	7.2	49	SHC-SD03	8/12	8 exceed standard, scattered	
		gamma-Chlordane	0.5	9.6	74	SHC-SD03	9/12	9 exceed standard, scattered	
	PCBs	ND					0/9		
	Metals (2)	Lead	35	6.1	206	SHC-SD03	12/12	7 exceed standard, none exceed background	
		Mercury	0.15	0.4	0.7	EC-SD01	2/12	2 exceed standard	
		Silver	1	1.9	2.8	EC-SD02	2/12	2 exceed standard, neither exceed BB	
		Zinc	120	1.5	338	EC-SD01	12/12	4 exceed standard, none exceed background	

#### Notes:

- Concentrations are presented in µg/L for liquid and µg/kg for solids (ppb), metal concentrations for soils and sediments are presented in mg/kg (ppm).
- (1) Positive contaminant detections in surface water were compared to appropriate NCWQS and NOAA saltwater screening values.
- (2) Total metals in surface water and sediment were also compared to the range of positive detections in upgradient samples at MCB, Camp Lejeunc.
- (3) Screening criteria are provided as a reference point and are Region IX Residential PRGs for surface and subsurface soil, NCWQS for groundwater, and NOAA for surface water and sediment.

ARAR - Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements
BC - Brinson Creek
NCWQS - North Carolina Water Quality Standard
EC - Edwards Creek

NA - Not applicable ND - Not detected

NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

# TABLE 5 REMOVAL ACTION ALTERNATIVES SUMMARY TABLE OPERABLE UNIT NO. 6, SITES 36, 43, 44 and 54 ENGINEERING EVALUATION / COST ANALYSIS, CTO-0219 MCB CAMP LEJEUNE, NORTH CAROLINA

Alternative	Media	Description / Components	Land Use Controls Needed	Screening Criteria	Cost
Site 36					
36S RAA 1) No Action	Soil	No remedial action or institutional controls	None	NA	\$0
36S RAA 2) Capping and Institutional Controls for Lead Contaminated Areas (1)	Soil	Soil cover over contaminated areas exceeding cleanup goals; site restoration; designate lead impacted soil areas for future land use restrictions		Four areas of elevated PAH and pesticde contaminated soil	\$188,000
36S RAA 3) Excavation and Off- Site Disposal and Institutional Controls for Lead Contaminated Areas (1)	Soil	Excavate all soils above cleanup levels; disposal of waste in appropriate landfills; site restoration; designate lead impacted soil areas for future land use restrictions	Excavation Restrictions	Four areas of elevated PAH and pesticde contaminated soil to a depht of 2 feet	\$201,000
Site 43 (2)					
43S RAA 1) No Action	Soil	No remedial action or institutional controls	None	NA	\$0
43S RAA 2) Capping and Institutional Controls	Soil	Soil cover over contaminated areas exceeding cleanup goals; site restoration; institutional controls including an intrusive activity boundary for the former site-wide dump.	Excavation Restrictions	Area of elevated PAH contaminated soil	\$170,000
43S RAA 3) Excavation and Off- Site Disposal and Institutional Controls	Soil	Excavate all soils above cleanup levels; disposal of waste in appropriate landfills; site restoration; institutional controls including an intrusive activity boundary for the former site-wide dump.	Excavation Restrictions	Area of elevated PAH contaminated soil to a depht of 3 feet	\$119,000

<sup>(1)</sup> Land use controls in place until remedial cleanup goals are achieved

<sup>(2)</sup> Note that institutional controls (i.e., Excavation Restrictions) will be in effect at Site 43 since it was a former disposal area















